

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12 and 14-28. Claims 1, 12 and 23-28 are amended herein. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 3-110, 12, 14-21 and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 6,047,260 (Levinson), U.S. Patent No. 5,519,606 (Frid), and claims 11 and 22 were rejected under Levinson, Frid and Windows 95™ Manual (Marks).

The invention of claim 1 includes, "classifying an inputted schedule into any type of a term type schedule or a period type schedule" based on "content of said inputted schedule indicated by a user." Claim 1 also recites, "selectively adjusting the schedules using different conditions in accordance with a combination of overlapped schedule types classified as the period type and the period type or the period type and the term type" including maintaining "overlapped term type schedules" and adjusting "all other overlapped schedule types without requiring an input from the user to indicate adjustment." Independent claims 12 and 23 recite similar features.

Similarly, claim 24 recites, "classifying a newly input schedule... based on content of said newly input schedule indicated by a user" and "automatically adjusting scheduling overlaps... according to said classifying", where some overlapped schedules are "maintained based on said classifying" and "all other scheduling overlaps are adjusted without requiring an input from the user to indicate adjustment of said other scheduling overlaps."

Independent claim 25 recites, "classifying the schedules into types based on content of said schedules indicated by a user" and "selectively adjusting existing schedules according to said classifying of the types, where "overlapped schedules having a predetermined type are maintained and all other overlapped schedules are adjusted without requiring an input from the user to indicate adjustment of said other overlapped schedules."

Claim 26 recites, "grouping the schedules into a first type or a second type based on corresponding schedule information including content of said schedules indicated by a user" and "... selectively adjusting the overlapped schedules without requiring an input from the user

indicating adjustment of said overlapped schedules, according to the grouping when each of the overlapped schedules are not classified into the first type.”

As recited in claims 27 and 28, the claimed invention is directed to classification of schedules “based on content of said schedules indicated by a user” and “selectively adjusting” overlapping schedules “without requiring the user to indicate” condition(s) to be applied to overlapped schedules.

In contrast to the claimed invention that selectively adjusts overlap of schedules in accordance with classification of the schedules, the calendar editor in Levinson determines whether there are any conflicts in the user’s schedule (see, col. 8, lines 3-6) and handles conflicts related to both floating and fixed tasks in an identical manner (see, col. 8, lines 28-39). As stated in Levinson, when a conflict is detected the system may choose from several possibilities based on priority levels, or prompt the user of the conflict to pick the choice for solving the conflict (see, col. 11, lines 62 through col. 12, line 6 and col. 13, lines 52-59). Meaning, Levinson does not teach or suggest managing or adjusting overlapped schedules based on classification the schedules into type(s), as taught by the claimed invention.

The Examiner relies on Frid as disclose maintaining overlapped term type schedules and adjusting of schedules without requiring input from a user. Per the Examiner’s own assertion, events in the Frid system may overlap one another whereby the duration lines are drawn in an overlapping fashion (see, col. 4, lines 56-58), or the user may reconcile the overlap of the events (see, col. 5, lines 52-64). That is, Frid provides the user with an option of reconciling or not reconciling with respect to each of the events, regardless of the type of classification.

In addition, according to Frid, when a user chooses not to reconcile an overlap, the overlap remains while the claimed invention adjusts all other overlapped schedule types “without an input from the user” (see above discussion of independent claims).

Levinson and Frid, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest above-identified features including selectively applying “conditions” in accordance with classification of the schedules “based on content of schedules indicated by a user” and “without requiring input from the user”, as recited in the independent claims.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims dependent on the independent claims are patentable over the references. For example, claim 4 recites that the inputted schedule is classified on the basis of “schedule information including an item regarding date/time, an item

regarding a place, an item regarding persons concerned, an item regarding the contents, an item regarding priority, and an item such as a schedule adjustment regarding a system which are inputted to a ToDo list.”

The Examiner appears to imply that Levinson teaches classification of a schedule based on schedule information. However, Levinson only discusses information that may be accessed by a user, such as a goals section, a scripts section, a cues section, a names section, a notes section, and a help section and edited by the user (see, Fig. 11 including corresponding text).

Levinson and Frid do not teach or suggest classifying a schedule based on “schedule information including an item regarding “date/time, a place, persons concerned, the contents, regarding priority” and “an item such as a schedule adjustment regarding a system which are inputted to a ToDo list”, as recited in claim 4 (see also, claim 15 which recites similar features).

Claims 11 and 22 recite, “storing the schedule deleted by the adjustment of said schedules and a position before the adjustment of the schedule moved due to the adjustment” and when the existing schedule is deleted “performing a recovery of the schedule deleted due to the schedule adjustment or a return of the schedule to an initial position moved due to the schedule adjustment.”

On the other hand, Marks is limited to addressing maintenance of a folder until the user confirms intent to remove the files selecting and deleting the files (see, page 1, paragraph 4).

The combination of the cited references including Marks does not teach or suggest the claimed management of schedules including “a recovery of the schedule deleted”, as recited in claims 11 and 22.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments were made to clarify the features claimed and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 09/764,301

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 06/19/2007

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501